

# STATE • INDIANA



INDIANA UTILITY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
302 W. WASHINGTON STREET, SUITE E-306  
INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA 46204-2764

<http://www.state.in.us/iurc/>  
Office: (317) 232-2701  
Facsimile: (317) 232-6758

IN THE MATTER OF THE COMMISSION )  
INVESTIGATION AND GENERIC PROCEEDING )  
OF RATES AND UNBUNDLED NETWORK )  
ELEMENTS AND COLLOCATION FOR INDIANA )  
BELL TELEPHONE COMPANY, INCORPORATED )  
d/b/a SBC INDIANA PURSUANT TO THE )  
TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1996 AND )  
RELATED INDIANA STATUTES )

CAUSE NO. 42393

FILED

DEC 23 2003

INDIANA UTILITY  
REGULATORY COMMISSION

You are hereby notified that on this date the Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission ("Commission") makes the following Entry in this Cause:

The Commission received responses to its fifth set of scenarios on December 22, 2003. Based on the results from these scenarios, the Commission has determined that additional scenarios need to be run. The additional scenarios are included on page 3 of this Entry.


On or before December 30, 2003, the parties should file an Excel spreadsheet with the services and the final UNE rates (recurring and nonrecurring charges) for the scenario. For reference, see SBC Indiana's Submission of Recalculated UNE Rates filed on November 21, 2003. Please indicate the percentage of shared and common costs used to calculate the final UNE rates.


As with other scenario responses the parties have provided, responses will be used to ascertain the effect of a comprehensive change in many inputs, and are not necessarily reflective of any final Commission determination.


If you have any questions regarding these scenarios, please e-mail Joel Fishkin using the Commission e-mail distribution list provided in this Cause, with e-mail copies to all parties as has been done in other electronic communications in this Cause. Commission responses to questions about the scenarios will, likewise, be sent electronically to all parties.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Larry S. Landis, Commissioner

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
William G. Divine, Administrative Law Judge

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Nancy E. Manley, Secretary to the Commission

## Scenario 14

Use Scenario 13 but with the following design changes **eliminated**:

- 10% of all cable shifted to next largest size: Pitkin/Turner page 151
- Larger Size of Distribution Areas: Increase FDI to the next largest size. Figure 10 on page 148; Eliminate feeder stubs, add cable to the distribution cable length, page 150; 10% of all cable shifted to next largest size, Pitkin/Turner, page 151
- Increase Termination equipment for business: Less use of 6-pair NID and move other to 25-pair terminal size. Pitkin/Turner, page 153

## Scenario 15

Use Scenario 13 but with the following design changes **eliminated**:

- 10% of all cable shifted to next largest size: Pitkin/Turner page 151
- Larger Size of Distribution Areas: Increase FDI to the next largest size. Figure 10 on page 148; Eliminate feeder stubs, add cable to the distribution cable length, page 150; 10% of all cable shifted to next largest size, Pitkin/Turner, page 151